

Liberty Demands Sovereignty Before Open Borders

Rebuttal by J.J. Johnson 09.10.01

With all due respect to my fellow ranch hand, Steve Trinward, I have to disagree with the opinions of 'open borders' for Constitutional reasons. Perhaps ["Liberty Demands Open Borders for the Land of the Free"](#) would work if the world was truly free. Since it's not, we have to deal with reality, including a little bit of history.

Triward wrote: *"...I am concerned about the lack of awareness of the true nature of Liberty exhibited by those who would seek to close down America's borders, as though this were some militaristic despotism with guards at all border-crossings. To focus on "national identity" as a goal more important than the preservation and spreading of the cause of Liberty, upon which this country was founded, is to deny our very foundation and surrender to the enemy camp...."*

Scattered throughout the Constitution are references mandating the government to raise armies and provide security - for the expressed purpose of protecting its borders. Allowing free passage from Mexico by their citizens does not spread the cause of Liberty - it only helps to support a despotism to the south. With all due respect to my dear friend Steve, the Constitution is our national identity. It and the Bill of Rights is what makes us different. Perhaps if Mexico were forced by its people to adopt the same rules, we would not be having this discussion.

I compare an 'Open Border Policy' to building houses without locks on the doors. Yes, we shouldn't need them, and at times, it's a pain to look for your keys. But is anyone reading this ready to leave all their doors unlocked and/or open and tell all their neighbors?

I think not.

Taking the hypothetical position that we have "Secured the Blessings of Liberty" here in America, in order for 'open borders' to work, we must assume that every nation has the same guidelines for migration and similar principles as this country. In short, to have open borders, 6 billion people would have to agree with it. If they don't, they put up their own walls, and call themselves a nation. If we dropped our border controls, that doesn't mean the others will as well. We cannot force other nations to open their borders, or change their laws concerning immigration and naturalization.

Unless that were to happen, I believe it would be a national security issue to blatantly just open our borders. More on that later.

But let's turn our attention to where the debate is - Mexico. Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution gives Congress the power to 'establish a uniform rule of naturalization'. This should be noted for those who support a President making a unilateral decision to change immigration policy, such as what is being contemplated. According to my read - that would be unconstitutional. Congress has set up laws (as required by the Constitution) to deal with

folks from around the world who wish to live in America. Any foreign national wishing to **become** an American can follow the correct guidelines at the U.S. embassy in their country. Other countries have the same rules.

If on the other hand, countries are too oppressive for their own people, we've even set up rules for 'refugee' status. For some reason, Mexicans either cannot or will not do this. Things seem to be so bad in Mexico that their citizens risk death to get here. With that in mind:

[shouting mode on]

HOW DARE EL PRESIDENTE FOX COME HERE AND TELL US HOW WE SHOULD ENFORCE **OUR** LAWS? IF MY CITIZENS WERE LEAVING MY COUNTRY IN DROVES FOR A BETTER LIFE, I'D BE EMBARRASSED - AND COMMITTED TO FIXING MY OWN MESS FIRST.

[shouting mode off]

This is not a slam against the Mexican people. But if there is a problem in their country, I'd just as soon send them crates of rifles and send them south toward Mexico City - that's where the problem is - with their own government.

But no, many Mexicans simply want to come here, make U.S. dollars and send them back home. Many have no desire to become Americans if they can get away with it. This helps support their own fragile economy.

The Canadian border is much longer than Mexico's, and many Canadians consider their own country among the most socialist in the world. Yet Canadian citizens aren't flocking here in droves. Most, in fact, insist on being Canadian - not American. You see, as bad as things might be in Canada, their government doesn't condone an industry that is a few nickels short of 'slave labor'.

But the ugly little problem here in the United States is that many people (especially wealthy folks) support illegal immigrants in this country. No social security taxes. No health benefits. No minimum wage laws. In fact, it's best to keep them illegal for many employers. By keeping them illegal, a threat can always be held over their heads that if they become a problem, the employer can just 'drop a dime' to the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). Without the weight of government regulations, we get can get Mexican employees dirt cheap.

The argument is "they only want jobs that most Americans don't want". Hogwash. Change the labor laws here, and employers can afford American labor without having to look south.

I didn't make the rules, nor did I piss off the rest of the world toward America. But as we know, there are those in the world who just don't like us, and would love to have the chance to stroll into this country and, to be blunt - raise hell, and the money to continue doing it. Yes, we have enemies out there. There are also communicable diseases out there. Reality dictates we have to deal with that - just like other countries around the world.

Mexico deals with this by shipping people who violate their immigration laws back to their

own countries without even a hearing. Just ask the folks from Costa Rica, and the 'gringos' who were living in Baja. If we didn't like what was going on in America, we could just leave. Of course, the next country has the right to throw us out if they don't want us here, and there isn't a thing we can do about it. That's reality.

The fact that a nation has rules to deal with citizen who are not native to that country is what makes it a country. It's what makes us 'sovereign'.

In Jason Hornberger column, "Locking Out the Immigrant," published just this spring, Hornberger said, the results of the current immigration "point only in the direction of future catastrophe. The U.S. government rightly criticizes the Soviet Union for not letting Jews emigrate ... but then is horrified at the prospect of having to let Soviet Jews enter the United States. And it rightly criticizes Vietnam for its oppressive society ... but then is horrified at the prospect of having to let too many Vietnamese "boat people" [come here]. but in my opinion, Hornberger was mistaken about these two groups.

Last I checked, there is nothing stopping Soviet Jews from immigrating to the U.S. outside of typical national security checks (there are still spies out there). And in fact, when most Soviet Jews were finally allowed to leave, most went to Israel, not the United States. As far as the Vietnamese are concerned, I wish the United States would criticize them. But they didn't just walk over the border unchecked. Most came here legally - under the 'refugee' status. There is a difference.

And this is the issue with the illegal immigration from Mexico and other countries. The words at the based of Lady Liberty say: "give us your poor, your tired ... the huddled masses yearning to breathe free" but as that statue has sat in the harbor all these years, there were laws in effect that most who sojourned to Ellis Island had to follow else be called a WOP (without papers). I have no problem with the words written above. But we have laws...'Knock before Entering"

Else, how can we assume you're not a trespasser into our home?

The Sierra Times

An Internet Publication for Real Americans © 2001 SierraTimes.com - All Rights Reserved